

Response to Official Action of August 8, 2008
Application No.: 09/806,304
Examiner: Ernesto GARCIA
Art Unit: 3679

AMENDMENT

Please amend the pending application in accordance with the following particulars.

In the Claims

The claims are amended as shown on the following pages under the heading LIST OF CURRENT CLAIMS. The list shows the status of all claims presently in the application and is intended to supersede all prior versions of the claims in the application. Any cancellation of claims is made without prejudice or disclaimer.

In the Drawings

A REPLACEMENT SHEET for changes made to the drawing figures of page 2 is submitted herewith.

Response to Official Action of August 8, 2008
Application No.: 09/806,304
Examiner: Ernesto GARCIA
Art Unit: 3679

AMENDMENT TO DRAWINGS

Figure 6 is amended in the attached REPLACEMENT SHEET of page 2 of the drawings to remove the brackets associated with reference numeral 40.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. In the claims

A. Claim amendments

As shown in the foregoing LIST OF CURRENT CLAIMS, the claims have been revised to more clearly point out the subject matter for which protection is sought.

Specifically, claims 1-65 remain canceled, and claims 66-84 are currently canceled.

New claims 85-96 are presented herein. The newly presented claims correspond to previously presented claims, or the specification, in the manner indicated below. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

New claim	Related to Old claim or specification
85	76, 77, parts of 72 and 78, and page 12, lines 5-7
86	Part of 78
87	79
88	Part of 80 and 81
89	82
90	83
91	84
92	70
93	71

Response to Official Action of August 8, 2008
Application No.: 09/806,304
Examiner: Ernesto GARCIA
Art Unit: 3679

94	Clean copy of substitute specification, page 11, lines 25-27
95	73
96	74

Entry of the LIST OF CURRENT CLAIMS is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

B. Claim objections

The claim objections are rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 66-84. In so far as the claim objections may be considered applicable to new claims 85-96, reconsideration and removal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

In particular, with reference to the use of the phrase "can be" in new claim 85, it is respectfully submitted that claim 85 is clear and definite. The specific recitation using the phrase "can be" is as follows:

the corner piece being equipped with inclined parts defining a pressure zone between the locking means and a place on the inner wall which is situated deeper in the attachment channels, so that there can be a pressure increase between said place and the locking means;

Since prior to insertion of the corner joint within the side members 2 and 3, the locking means have not been activated, or upset, there will be no pressure increase in the corner piece. Following the insertion of the corner joint within the side members 2 and 3, and activation of the locking means, there will be a pressure increase in the corner piece. Thus, there is not always a pressure increase in the corner piece, but instead, a pressure increase can be provided by activating the locking means.

Therefore, contrary to the change indicated by the Office action that there "is" a pressure increase, which requires a pressure increase to always be present, the use of the phrase "can be" is more appropriate, since there can be a pressure increase once

the corner joint is inserted within the side members and the locking means is activated. The use of the phrase "can be" requires that a pressure increase can be, but is not always, present, and there is nothing unclear about this usage.

Accordingly, since the use of the phrase "can be" is clear, removal of this claim objection is respectfully requested.

Turning to the suggested change with respect to claim 76 (now part of claim 85) to use the phrase "respectively connected to the free ends of the resilient members," this change has been incorporated into new claim 85, and removal of this claim objection is respectfully requested.

With regard to the suggested changes to claim 84 (new claim 91), claim 91 has been written to clarify that a panel is provided, the panel being wedged up by wedges. Accordingly, removal of this claim objection is respectfully requested.

C. Rejection of claims 69-84 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 69-84. In so far as the rejection may be considered applicable to new claims 85-96, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 70 (new claim 92), it is respectfully submitted that claim 92 is clear and definite. The recitation of a resilient member, and the subsequent description of the structure of the resilient member, are related to independent features of the resilient member. In other words, the resiliency of the resilient member is independent from the recited structure of the resilient member. In particular, the resiliency of the resilient member can be provided by the material that the resilient member is made from, regardless of the structure of the resilient member. Therefore, it is clear that new claim 92 recites a resilient member that has the specific structure of a second leg and a connecting leg situated in an extension of the second leg, and that the recited structure does not determine the resiliency of the resilient member.

Accordingly, since claim 92 is clear and definite, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 76 (part of new claim 85), the usage of the phrases "pressed-in material part," "material parts," and "material" is clear and definite for the following reasons.

The "interlocking between the corner piece and the side members is carried out by locking means, which are formed of lips defined by a pressed-in material part of the outer wall." The outer wall defines the attachment channel of the side member. Thus, the material of the side members is pressed-in to form the lips.

Further, "the locking means comprising material parts which are upset by compressing the material" requires that the locking means, defined as being formed of lips, are upset by compressing the material of the locking means, which are defined as being formed of lips. Accordingly, the lips comprise material parts which are upset by compressing the material of the lips. So the relation between the "material parts" and the "pressed-in material parts" is as follows.

The locking means are defined as being formed of lips, and thus the locking means are lips. The lips include a pressed-in material part of the outer wall of the attachment channel of the side member, so the "pressed-in material part" represents the complete locking means. The pressed-in material part of the locking means includes upset material parts that help to form the pressed-in material parts. Accordingly, the recited structure of the "pressed-in material part," "material parts," and "material" in claim 85 is clear and definite, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With regard to the assertion in the Office action that claim 76 (part of new claim 85) recites "the inclined parts being equipped with resilient members which are connected to one another at an angle," it is respectfully submitted that claim 85 does not include such a recitation. It appears that the Office action inadvertently confuses the recitation of the "inclined parts" and the "insert parts," where the insert parts are "equipped with resilient members which are connected to one another at an angle." As described below, the resilient members are indicated by reference numeral 40, and are connected to each other at an angle. Since this language is clear and is properly

descriptive of the claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 85 is clear and definite, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With further regard to the recitation of a free end having something attached thereto, it is respectfully submitted that a free end can have something attached at one end thereof and can still be considered a free end. For example, if a pole is placed in the ground in order to bear a flag, it is possible to consider the end of the pole that is placed in the ground to be a fixed end, and the end extending into the air, and upon which the flag to be born is placed, a free end. The free end remains free even if a flag is attached thereto. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that a person having ordinary skill in the art would understand the usage of this recitation, and therefore claim 85 is clear and definite and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With regard to the usage of "the upsetting" and "the total mitre" in new claim 85, the phrases have been revised to provide clear antecedent basis. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 80 (part of new claim 88), the redundant language has been removed, and the remaining identified language is not recited. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 82 (new claim 89) the phrase "an inner wall" has been revised to be "the inner wall" for clarification. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

2. In the drawings

A. Replacement sheet

Figure 6 is presently amended in the REPLACEMENT SHEET of page 2 of the drawings. Specifically, the brackets associated with reference numeral 40 have been removed. It is respectfully submitted that no new subject matter is introduced.

Acceptance of the REPLACEMENT SHEET is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

B. Drawing objections

Reconsideration and removal of the drawing objections is respectfully requested.

With respect to reference numerals 5 and 6 in Fig. 3 and reference numeral 40 in Fig. 6, it is respectfully submitted that the usage of these reference numerals complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4).

Specifically, as discussed in the first paragraph on page 5 and the second paragraph on page 11 of the clean copy of the substitute specification, it can be seen that reference numerals 5 and 6 respectively designate the complete insert parts of the corner piece, which are inserted into the respective attachment channels 7 and 8. Further, reference numeral 40 only indicates a portion of the respective insert parts 5 and 6, which portion is subject to a tensile force under the influence of the locking means.

Accordingly, it can be seen that reference numeral 40 indicates only the portion of the respective insert parts 5 and 6, and thus, different reference numerals are not used to identify the same part, and removal of this drawing objection is respectfully requested.

The brackets associated with reference numeral 40 have been removed. Accordingly, removal of this drawing objection is respectfully requested.

With respect to identifying the free ends with a reference numeral, it is respectfully submitted that the free ends are clearly the ends opposed to the connecting ends of the resilient member. As discussed on page 11, lines 5 and 6 of the clean copy of the substitute specification, the resilient members 40 are connected to one another at an angle, and as a consequence, the ends by which the resilient members are connected are not free ends. It is therefore clear that the ends opposed to the connected ends of the resilient members are to be considered free ends. Further, as described on page 11, lines 21-24 of the clean copy of the substitute specification, the free ends of the resilient members are linked to the inclined parts 34.

Accordingly, since the free ends of the resilient members are clearly shown in the drawings, removal of this drawing objection is respectfully requested.

Turning to the features of claim 76 that are allegedly not shown in the drawings, this objection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 76. In so far as the objection may be considered applicable to new claim 85, reconsideration and removal of this objection is respectfully requested, on the basis that both the free ends of the resilient members and the inclined parts being connected to the free ends are shown at least in Figs. 1, 3, and 6.

As described on page 9, lines 18-20 of the clean copy of the substitute specification, the inclined parts are designated by reference numeral 34, shown in Figs. 3 and 6. As discussed on page 9, lines 24-26 of the clean copy of the substitute specification, reference numeral 35, on the contrary, designates a part of the outer wall 14, and is not an inclined part.

Further, as discussed above, the resilient members 40 are only the parts of the insert parts 5 and 7 which are subjected to a tensile force. On the contrary, inclined parts 34 are not subjected to a tensile force, but rather a compression force under the action of compressed lips 13. Thus, contrary to the assertion in the Office action, the inclined parts are not considered as being part of the resilient members 40. Further, as is shown at least in Figs. 3 and 6, the inclined parts 34 are connected to the accompanying free end of the resilient members 40.

Therefore, since every feature of claim 85 is shown in the drawings, removal of this drawing objection is respectfully requested.

3. In the specification

The objection to the specification is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 70, which contains the identified language.

In so far as the objection to the specification may be considered applicable to new claim 92, which corresponds to former claim 70, reconsideration and removal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested on the basis that the

identified language finds antecedent basis at least on page 9, lines 28-31, and page 10, line 31 through page 11 line 9 of the clean copy of the substitute specification.

In particular, the second leg is identified by reference numeral 27, and the "connecting leg situated in an extension of the second leg" 27 is identified by reference numeral 28 (page 9, lines 28-31 "legs...which are detached from the environment, apart from a number of local *connections*, for example at their ends (emphasis added); page 11, lines 8-9). Thus, the leg 27 is considered to be a connecting leg. This feature is also shown at least in Figs. 1, 3, and 6.

Accordingly, removal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claims 66, 67, 70, 71, and 75 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2,734,599 (Boerner) in view of DE 2,522,523 (Rottner) in view of EP 549,554 (Ronnlund)

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 66, 67, 70, 71, and 75. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

5. Rejection of claims 68 and 69 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2,734,599 (Boerner) in view of DE 2,522,523 (Rottner) in view of EP 549,554 (Ronnlund) and further in view of EP 412,669 (Rhodes)

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 68 and 69. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

6. Rejection of claim 72 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2,734,599 (Boerner) in view of DE 2,522,523 (Rottner) in view of EP 549,554 (Ronnlund) and further in view of DE 4,305,377 (Hustadt)

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 72. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

7. Rejection of claims 76, 80, 82, and 83 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2,734,599 (Boerner)

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 76, 80, 82, and 83. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

8. Rejection of claim 77 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2,734,599 (Boerner) in view of DE 19,700,604 (Kluber)

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 77. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

9. Rejection of claim 78 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2,734,599 (Boerner) in view of EP 549,554 (Ronnlund)

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 78. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

10. Rejection of claim 79 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2,734,599 (Boerner) in view of EP 549,554 (Ronnlund) and further in view of DE 2,522,523 (Rottner)

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 79. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

11. Rejection of claim 84 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2,734,599 (Boerner) in view of EP 412,669 (Rhodes)

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 77. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

12. Allowable subject matter

The applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 73, 74, and 81. Claims 73 and 74 have been respectively rewritten as claims 95 and 96, dependent from new claim 85, which is believed to patentable for its respective recited features.

13. New claims 85-96

New claim 85 is presented to recite features previously presented in claims 76, and 77, parts of claims 72 and 78, and described in the clean copy of the substitute specification on page 12, lines 5-7.

In particular, the embodiment of claim 85 requires a corner joint comprising two frame side members having attachment channels and mitered end portions, and at least one corner piece having two insert parts joined at connecting ends and positioned relative to one another at a predetermined angle, each insert part configured to be received by the mitered end portions of a respective one of the attachment channels of the side members.

The attachment channels are confined by an inner wall and an outer wall, wherein a mutual interlocking between the corner piece and the side members is carried out by locking means, which are formed of lips defined by a pressed-in material part of the outer wall, which lips cooperate with notches defined on the corner piece. Each insert part includes at least one notch comprising a triangular shape defined by a first side against which the lip projection is positioned which is longer than a second side over which a free end of the lip projection is pressed in.

Accordingly, the locking means generate a pre-stress in the form of pressure on both side members and tension in the corner piece. The locking means comprise material parts which are upset by compressing the material, wherein the upset of the material parts has a useful working force on a total mitre and a compression force has been created in the side members ends by pushing off both side members on the locking means.

The corner piece is equipped with inclined parts defining a pressure zone between the locking means and a place on the inner wall which is situated deeper in the attachment channels, so that there can be a pressure increase between the place and the locking means.

The insert parts are equipped with resilient members which are connected to one another at an angle and the inclined parts are respectively connected to the free ends of the resilient members.

A free space or clearance free of massive material is provided on the outside corner of the corner piece, the free space or clearance extending from the locking means to at least the connecting end of the insert parts.

The inclined parts form means to create a tensile force in the resilient members, since the pressure in the inclined parts results in a tension in the resilient members and the tensile forces in the resilient members result in pressure forces in the outer and inner walls, thus contributing to the rigidity and pre-stress of the obtained mitre as a whole.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, or Hustadt* publications, when considered alone or in combination, disclose every feature of new claim 85.

As is recited in claim 85, one advantage of the claimed configuration is that the locking means create a compressive force in the inclined parts 34, which results in a tensile force being formed in the resilient members 40. The tensile force created in the resilient members 40 acts as a kind of pre-load that helps to maintain the side members 2 and 3 firmly connected together.

In order to create the required compressive stress in the inclined parts, and the subsequent tensile force in the resilient members, it is important for the locking means to be in the form of lips that cooperate with notches defined on the corner piece, the notches having a triangular shape defined by a first side against which the lip projections is positioned, which is longer than a second side over which a free end of the lip projection is pressed in, as is recited in claim 85.

The *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications fail to disclose the recited structure of claim 85, and further fail to disclose creating a tensile force in the elastic members of the insert parts, and hence fail to disclose

creating a compression force in the side members. While a number of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications do disclose pressed-in parts of side members, none of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications, either alone or in combination, disclose the structure of locking means to be in the form of lips that cooperate with notches defined on the corner piece, the notches having a triangular shape defined by a first side against which the lip projections is positioned, which is longer than a second side over which a free end of the lip projection is pressed in, such that a compression force is created in the inclined parts to cause a tensile force in the resilient members such that a compression force is created in the side members, as is required by claim 85.

Instead, the structures of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications do not create compressive forces in the corner pieces. This can be understood as follows. The material of the side members of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications, which may be pressed-in in notches in later stages of assembly, is before the deformation lying parallelly with the side members.

After being pressed-in, the pressed-in portions of the side members of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications are actually stretched in order to have increased dimensions that correspond to the shapes of the notches into which the pressed-in portions are pressed.

Since the pressed-in parts are deformed in order to increase their dimensions, the inherent elasticity of the material of the side members will create internal opposing forces to prevent an increase in the dimension of the pressed-in part. Thus, in contrast to the embodiment of claim 85, which requires a compression force to be created within the side members, tensile forces are created in the side members of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications.

The deficiencies of known joints, such as those disclosed in the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications, are discussed on page 2, lines 1-3 of the clean copy of the substitute specification. Specifically, such known

locking means are "only used as locks...without actually contributing to the rigidity and prestress of the obtained mitre as a whole."

The configurations of the joints disclosed in the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications can include a small play between the locking means and the side members, due to the inherent elasticity of the pressed-in parts. Thus, such joints are not as desirable for use.

In contrast to the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications, the joint according to claim 85 includes a lip projection having a free end, such that the dimension of the lip is reduced during the deformation by pressing the lip with its free end over a side wall of a triangular notch.

Accordingly, in contrast to the tensile forces created in the side members of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications, there is a compressive force created in the side members due to the inherent elasticity of the lip material. This compressive force helps to maintain the side members of the joint together, thus eliminating the play between the locking means and the side members, as can be present in the joints disclosed in the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications.

Further, the triangular shape of the notch recited in claim 85 is important because it allows the lip 13 to be pressed in until it is in contact with the stop part 23, and as a consequence, the pressing in of the lips by way of a press is very much simplified and much larger forces can be applied.

Further still, by providing the stop part 23 with a surface which is carried out in relief in the shape of a serration (claim 88), the lip 13 can also be easily glued to the stop part so that a firm connection can be obtained.

Thus, a lip projection that is pressed-in in a notch of triangular shape until it resides against one side of the triangle causes the lip projection to be supported by that side of the triangle so that a collapse of the lip under a buckling load will be less

probable. As a consequence, a much higher compression load can be applied, which again increases the strength of the joint.

Additionally, the embodiment according to claim 85 requires a free space or clearance free of massive material that is provided on the outside corner of the corner piece, the free space or clearance extending from the locking means to at least the connecting end of the insert parts.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber*, and *Hustadt* publications discloses such a structure. While the *Hustadt* publication appears to disclose a slot in the corner piece, the slot cannot be considered a free space or clearance free of massive material, as is required by claim 85, since there is massive material along the outside corner of the corner piece along both sides of the slot.

Further, while the *Kluber* publication discloses a free space positioned directly at the corner, the free space does not extend from the locking means to at least the connecting end of the insert parts, as is required by claim 85.

Additionally, each of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber*, and *Hustadt* publications disclose corner pieces having substantial amounts of material at the outside corner of the corner piece, in contrast to new claim 85.

As discussed, the embodiment of claim 85 does not include such material at the outside corner of the corner piece. Because of the free space or clearance 42 provided between the lips 13 and the mitered end portions 11 of the side members 2 and 3, the tension created in the resilient members 40 by pressing in the lip projections 13 will be transferred to the side members 2 and 3, thus creating a compressive stress between the side members 2 and 3. Thus, a strong connection between the side members 2 and 3 is ensured.

This is the case even of the mitered end portions are not cut in a perfect 45 degree angle with respect to the side walls of the side members 2 and 3. With the configuration of the embodiment according to claim 85, in such a case, the corner

piece 1 will be deformed somewhat until both side members 2 and 3 are brought into close contact with one another.

This weakness of the corner joint according to claim 85 in the outermost region is actually what makes the corner joint according to claim 85 so strong.

This recited configuration is in contrast to the joints of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications, in which massive amounts of material are provided at the outside corner of the corner piece in order to provide a rigid and solid corner piece. Thus, the joints of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications do not allow the corner piece to be somewhat flexible at the outside corner thereof to transfer tension therein to the side members, thus bringing the side members in closer contact, as is required by claim 85.

Instead, the joints of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications disclose a configuration that prevents what is capable with the structure recited in claim 85.

The remaining new claims 86-96 depend from claim 85, and are therefore patentable as containing all of the recited elements of claim 85, as well as for their respective recited features.

Additionally, with respect to claim 89, it is respectfully submitted that the *Boerner* publication fails to disclose the recited features of claim 89. In particular, as discussed on page 7, lines 7-23 of the *Boerner* publication, the insert parts 14 and 15 are made from three caissons 4, 5, and 12 (Figures 2 and 7), the caissons being provided with holes for weight reduction. It is not clear from the disclosure of the *Boerner* publication if the holes provided penetrate through the entire structure of the three caissons. Thus, it is not clear that the end portions of the insert parts can be considered to have a triangular shape.

For example, from the cross-section shown in Fig. 7 of the *Boerner* publication it is clear that the intermediate caisson 12 is most probably not provided with triangular shaped holes. Even if the walls of the intermediate caisson 12 are

provided with holes, it is unlikely that these holes will correspond in shape to the holes in the walls of the outer caissons 4 and 5, since the intermediate caisson 12 is much smaller than the outer caissons 4 and 5.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that a structure having three caissons 4, 5, and 12, wherein the outer most walls are provided with holes, cannot be considered as a structure that has legs forming a triangular shape, as is required by claim 89. In particular, taking the structures A7-A8-A9 designated in the Office action as first, second, and third legs, it is seen that the structure A7 cannot be considered a "leg" since it is provided with connecting means 16 for fixing a screw. Thus, in contrast to claim 89, the "insert parts" 14 and 15 of the *Boerner* publication do not include "an end portion geometrically configured in the shape of a triangle," or three legs, but rather merely a hollow profile built up of three parallel caissons in which a triangular shaped hole is provided.

With respect to claim 91, it is respectfully submitted that the *Rhodes* publication fails to disclose a panel being wedged up by wedges, wherein the middle of the wedges is situated in the prolongation of the inclined parts.

With the recited configuration, the lip projections 13 create a compressive stress in the inclined parts 34, and a reacting force is created along the direction of the inclined parts 34 between the inner surface of the attachment channels and the outer surface of the attachments channels. By placing the wedges 17, which support a panel 16, in the prolongation of the inclined parts 34, the aforementioned forces present between the inner and outer surface of the attachment channels will help to support the panel 16.

There is simply no disclosure in the *Rhodes* publication of utilizing wedges in this configuration.

With respect to claim 92, it is respectfully submitted that none of the *Boerner*, *Rottner*, *Ronnlund*, *Rhodes*, *Kluber*, and *Hustadt* publications disclose the feature of the resilient members 40 providing a reactive tensile force to the compression force

which occurs in the side members via the locking means. As discussed in detail above, the joint configurations of the *Boerner, Rottner, Ronnlund, Rhodes, Kluber, and Hustadt* publications simply do not disclose creating a compression force in the side members via the locking means, as is required by claim 92.

With respect to claim 93, which depends from claim 92, which also recites a second leg and a connecting leg structure, as discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the caisson structure of the *Boerner* publication cannot be considered a leg structure. Additionally, the *Boerner* publication fails to disclose resilient members in the manner recited in claim 93.

From the cross-section in Fig. 4 of the *Boerner* publication, it can be understood that the attachment channels of profiles 1 and 8 are not continuous in the corner, in order to allow for the introduction of a connection means 19 having a pin 20. Thus, the connection in the corner is realized, not by the inner surfaces of the profiles 1 and 8, but rather by the outer surfaces. Therefore, even if some parts of the profiles 1 and 8 are considered to be resilient members, the connection parts of such resilient members in the corner, which form the angle, are taken at the outside surface of the attachment channels, and not along an inner wall of the attachment channels, as is required by claim 93.

The advantages of the configuration of the corner joint in accordance with claims 85-96 are supported by test results obtained by the Belgian Building Research Institute (a copy of the Dutch language report is attached hereto).

For the report, joints in accordance with the pending claims were tested in the most severe conditions and it appears that even the smallest available corner piece could withstand the most extreme tests without failing.

In the middle of page 1 of the report, the name of the inventor of the pending application (Alain Brochez) can be seen.

The image on the second page represents the dimensions of the window which has been tested.

Page 4 includes a table which lists the sequence of the tests. The last column of the table indicates which norm has been applied for the testing conditions. Tests identified at lines 9 and 11 are of importance, which tests respectively regard testing for misusing the window by applying extreme load forces on the nose, and misuse of the window by application of a moment load on the window.

The mechanical test results are shown in Table 4.5 on page 11. This table indicates that even the highest load of 800 N (80 kg) on the nose, which is applied for the highest class testing, i.e. Class 4 testing, was no problem. The test result for load on the nose was, for example during application of the 800 N load force, the window deformed only 4.05 mm, and after removal of the load, the residual deformation was only 0.16 mm, and the window could be closed as if the 800 N load had never been applied. This result is even more remarkable when it is considered that the dimensions of the profile used (as shown on page 16) are only 67 mm.

The same tests on similarly sized windows constructed in accordance with prior art configurations would result in the complete destruction of the window, or result in a window having such a large permanent deformation that it is impossible to close the window.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the corner joint according to claims 85-96 is superior to existing prior art corner joints.

Response to Official Action of August 8, 2008
Application No.: 09/806,304
Examiner: Ernesto GARCIA
Art Unit: 3679

14. Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicants' attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: January 8, 2009

Respectfully submitted,
/Patrick M. Buechner, Reg. #57,504/

PATRICK M. BUECHNER
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 57,504